The undersigned, legal owner(s) of the property situate in Baltimore County and which is described in the description and plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, hereby petition for a Variance from Section 1802.3.C.1 to permit lot widths of 50, in lieu of the required 55 and to permit sideyard setbacks of at, in lieu of the required 10: Section 400.1 - to permit a side yard setback of 0' in 1017-83 RE: PETITION FOR VARIANCES BEFORE THE ZONING COMMISSIONER N/S of College Ave., 50' NW of lieu of the required 2.5.

of the Zoning Regulations of Baltimore County, to the Zoning Law of Baltimore County; for the following reasons: (indicate hardship or practical difficulty) Greenspring Dr., 8th District OF BALTIMORE COUNTY SARA ANN RUHL, Petitioner Case No. 84-80-A Lots already exist with 50° widths and previous side yard setbacks would allow a house width of 35' BALTIMORE COUNTY :::::: BALTIMORE COUNTY ZONING PLANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ORDER TO ENTER APPEARANCE September 9, 1983 Mr. Commissioner: COUNTY OFFICE BLDG. ZONING PLANS Property is to be posted and advertised as prescribed by Zoning Regulations. 111 W. Chesapeake Ave. Towson, Maryland 21204 Pursuant to the authority contained in Section 524.1 of the Baltimore County I, or we, agree to pay expenses of above Variance advertising, posting, etc., upon filing of this petition, and further agree to and are to be bound by the zoning regulations and restrictions of Baltimore County adopted pursuant to the Zoning Law For Baltimore County. Charter, I hereby enter my appearance in this proceeding. You are requested to notify Mark P. Hanley, Jr., Esquire 206 Washington Avenue me of any hearing date or dates which may be now or hereafter designated therefor, ADVISORY COMMITTEE Towson, Maryland 21204 I/We do solemnly declare and affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that I/we are the legal owner(s) of the property and of the passage of any preliminary or final Order in connection therewith. RE: Case #84-80-A (Item No. 22) MEMBERS Petitioner - Sara Ann Ruhl which is the subject of this Petition Contract Purchaser: Engineering Variance Petition Legal Owner(s): Department of Dear Mr. Hanley: Traffic Engineering Sara Ann Ruhl (Type or Print Name) State Roads Commission (Type or Print Name) Peter Max Zimmerman The Zoning Plans Advisory Committee has reviewed the plans John W. Hessian, III submitted with the above referenced petition. The following comments People's Counsel for Baltimore County Deputy People's Counsel 11/1 Fire Prevention are not intended to indicate the appropriateness of the zoning action Rm. 223, Court House requested, but to assure that all parties are made aware of plans or Health Department Towson, Maryland 21204 problems with regard to the development plans that may have a bearing Project Planning on this case. The Director of Planning may file a written report with (Type or Print Name) Building Department the Zoning Commissioner with recommendations as to the suitability of I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 25th day of August, 1983, a copy of the foregoing Board of Education the requested zoning. Zoning Administration Order was mailed to Mark P. Hanley, Jr., Esquire, 206 Washington Avenue, Towson, Enclosed are all comments submitted from the members of the Attorney for Petitioner: Committee at this time that offer or request information on your 1203 Harper House P. Hanley, Jr. petition. If similar comments from the remaining members are received, Village of Cross Keys 323-4441 MD 21204, Attorney for Petitioner; and Mr. James W. McKee, 1717 York Road, I will forward them to you. Otherwise, any comment that is not informative will be placed in the hearing file. This petition was Lutherville, MD 21093, who requested notification. Baltimore, MD 21210 accepted for filing on the date of the enclosed filing certificate and a hearing scheduled accordingly. Name, address and phone number of legal owner, contract purchaser or representative to be contacted altimore, MD 21204 PETITION AND SITE PLAN John W. Hessian, III 1717 York Road NICHOLAS B. COMMODARI Attorney's Telephone No.: 823-1174 Lutherville, ND 21093 252-5820 Chairman Zoning Plans Advisory Committee OPDERED By The Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, this _____19th EVALUATION COMMENTS NBC:mch Enclosures cc: McKee & Associates, Inc. 1717 York Road County, on the ______21st _____ay of __September_____, 19_83_, at 10:30_o'clock Lutherville, Maryland 21093 __A__M. July 2008 Aug 8, 1983 Zoning Item # 22 Page 2 BALTIMORE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH BALTIMORE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC ENGINEERING
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204
494-3550 BALTIMORE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204 Zoning Commissioner Office of Planning and Zoning () Any existing underground storage tanks containing gasoline, waste oil. County Office Building solvents, etc., must have the contents removed by a licensed hauler and Towson, Maryland 21204 either be removed from the property or properly backfilled. STEPHEN E. COLLINS DIRECTOR Zoning Item # 22, Zoning Advisory Committee Meeting of July 19, 1983

Property Owner: Sara Ann Ruhl

Location: ME/5 Cellege Drive District 8th

Water Supply public Sewage Disposal public September 1, 1983 HARRY J. PISTEL, P. E. DIRECTOR () Soil percolation tests have been conducted. The results are valid until _ August 19, 1983 Revised plans must be submitted prior to approval of the percolation Mr. William Hammond Mr. Arnold Jablon Zoning Commissioner () Prior to occupancy approval, the potability of the water supply must be verified by collection of bacteriological and chemical water samples.
 () In accordance with Section 13-117 of the Baltimore County Code, the water Zoning Commissioner County Office Building County Office Building Towson, Maryland 21204 COMMENTS ARE AS FOLLOWS: Towson, Maryland 21204 well yield test () Prior to approval of a Building Permit for construction, renovation and/or) shall be valid until
) is not acceptable and must be retested. This must be accomplished Re: Item #22 (1983-1984) Item No. 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 ZAC - Meeting of July 19, 1983 Property Owner: installation of equipment for any existing or proposed food service facility. Property Owner: Sara Ann Ruhl prior to conveyance of property or approval of Building Permit complete plans and specifications must be submitted to the Plans Review N/ES College Avenue 50 N/W from centerline of Location: Section, Environmental Support Services, for final review and approval. Applications. Existing Zoning: Greenspring Drive Acres: 150 x 135 District: 8th Proposed Zoning: () Prior to new installation/s of fuel burning equipment, the owner should contact the Division of Air Pollution Control, 494-3775, to obtain requirements for such installation/s before work begins.
 () A permit to construct from the Division of Air Pollution Control is required () All roads and parking areas should be surfaced with a dustless, bonding Dear Mr. Jablon: The following comments are furnished in regard to the plat submitted to this () No health hazards are anticipated. office for review by the Zoning Advisory Committee in connection with the subject for such items as spray paint processes, underground gasoline storage tank/s (X) Others Priar to approval of a Building Permit, A

Hydrogeological Study and an Environmental Effects

Report may be required. (5,000 gallons or more) and any other equipment or process which exhausts Acres: into the atmosphere. District: A permit to construct from the Division of Air Pollution Control is required Highways: for any charbroiler operation which has a total cooking surface area of five College Avenue, an existing public road, is proposed to be further improved (5) square feet or more. Dear Mr. Hammond: in the future as a 30-foot closed section roadway on a 50-foot right-of-way. () Prior to approval of a Building Permit Application for renovations to exist-The Department of Traffic Engineering has no comments for Sediment Control: ing or construction of new health care facilities, complete plans and item numbers 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25. specifications of the building, food service area and type of equipment to Development of this property through stripping, grading and stabilization could be used for the food service operation must be submitted to the Plans Review result in a sediment pollution problem, damaging private and public holdings downand Approval Section, Division of Engineering and Maintenance, State Department stream of the property. A grading permit is, therefore, necessary for all grading, of Health and Mental Hygiene for review and approval. including the stripping of top soil. () Prior to any new construction or substantial alteration of public swimming Storm Drains: pool, wading pool, bathhouse, saunas, whirlpools, hot tubs, water and sewerage facilities or other appurtenances pertaining to health and safety; two (2) The Petitioner must provide necessary drainage facilities (temporary or copies of plans and specifications must be submitted to the Baltimore County permanent) to prevent creating any nuisances or damages to adjacent properties, MSF/ccm Department of Health for review and approval. For more complete information, especially by the concentration of surface waters. Correction of any problem contact the Recreational Hygiene Section, Division of Environmental Support which may result, due to improper grading or improper installation of drainage Services. facilities, would be the full responsibility of the Petitioner. () Prior to approval for a nursery school, owner or applicant must comply with Water and Sanitary Sewer: all Baltimore County regulations. For more complete information, contact the Division of Maternal and Child Health. There is a 6-inch public water main and 8-inch public sanitary sewerage in College Avenue. () If lubrication work and oil changes are performed at this location, the method providing for the elimination of waste oil must be in accordance

with Water Resources Administration requirements.

SS 20 1082 (1)

PETITION FOR ZONING VARIANCE 34-90-A

TO THE ZONING COMMISSIONER OF BALTIMORE COUNTY:

RAM: EAM: FWR: 83

Ian J. Forrest. Director

SS 20 1080 (2)

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Pursuant to the advertisement, posting of property, and public hearing on the Petition and it appearing that strict compliance with the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations would/would not result in practical difficulty and unreasonable hardship upon the Petitioner(s) and the granting of the variance(s) requested will/will not adversely affect the health safety, and general welfare of the community, the variance(s) should /should not be granted,

Therefore, IT IS ORDERED by the Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, this _____, 19_____, that the herein Petition for Variance(s) to permit

BALTIMORE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITS & LICENSES TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

August 23, 1983 TED ZALESKI, JR.

Mr. Villiam E. Essmond, Zoning Commissioner Office of Planning and Zoning County Office Building

Towson, Maryland

Sara Ann Ruhl
NE/S College Drive 50' N/W from centerline of Greenspring Drive
D.R. 5.5 Variance to permit lot widths of 50' in lieu of the required 55' and to permit sideyard setback of 8' in lieu of the required 10'.

District:

X A. All structure shall conform to the Baltimore County Building Code 1981/ Council Bill 1-82 State of Maryland Code for the Handicapped and Aged;

X B. A building/and other miscellameous permits shal. required before beginning

X C. Residential: Three sets of construction drawings are required to file a permit application. Architect/Engineer seal is/is not required. D. Commercial: Three sets of construction drawings with a Maryland Registered

Architect or Engineer shall be required to file a permit application. B. An exterior wall erected within 6'0 of an adjacent lot line shall be of one hour fire resistive construction, no openings permitted within 3'-0 of lot lines. A firevall is required in construction is on the lot line, See Table 401, line 2

F. Requested variance conflicts with the Baltimore County Building Code,

G. A change of occupancy shall be applied for, along with an alteration permit application, and three required sets of drawings indicating how the structure vill meet the Code requirements for the proposed change. Drawings may require

H. Before this office can comment on the above structure, please have the owner, thro the services of a Registered in Maryland architect or Engineer certify to this office, that, the structure for which a proposed change in use is proposed can comply with the height/area requirements of Table 505 and the required construction classification of Table 401.

HOTE: These comments reflect only on the information provided by the drawings submitted to the office of Planning and Zoning and are not intended to be construed as the rull extent of any permit. If desired, additional information may be obtained by visiting Room #122 (Plans Review) at 111 West Chesapeake Ave., 21204

Plans Review

Present Zoning: Proposed Zoning:

Robert Y. Dubel, Superintendent

Mr. William E. Hammond

Towson, Maryland 21204

Baltimore County Office Building

1111 West Chesapeake Avenue

Property Owner:

Location:

Zoning Commissioner

District: No. Acres:

Dear Mr. Hammond:

All of the above have no bearing on student population.

BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Very truly yours/ Wm. Nick Petrovich, Assistant Department of Planning

Towson, Maryland - 21204

Date: July 18, 1983

Z.A.C. Meeting of: July 19, 1983

WNP/bp

BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

Arnold Jablon Zoning Commissioner August 25, 1983 Norman E. Gerber FROM Director of Planning and Zoning Sara Ann Ruhl

There are no comprehensive planning factors requiring comment on this petition.

Director of Planning and Zoning

NEG:JGH:cav

SUBJECT___

84-80-A

IN RE: PETITION ZONING VARIANCES BEFORE THE N/S of College Avenue, 50' NW of Greenspring Drive - 8th ZONING COMMISSIONER Election District OF BALTIMORE COUNTY Sara Ann Ruhl.

Fetitioner

* * * * * * * * * * FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case No. 84-80-A

The Petitioners herein request variances to permit lot widths of 50 feet instead of the required 55 feet on three lots they own, and to permit side yard setbacks of eight feet instead of the required ten feet. They also request a side yard setback of zero feet instead of the required 2.5 feet for an accessory building, a garage, which exists in the rear of one of the lots. The purpose of their requests is to enable the Petitioners to sever the existing lots into building lots and construct residences.

The Petition as filed was amended at hearing to include Ruhl Development Corporation, the legal owner of Lots 17 and 19. The Petitioner, Sara Ann Ruhl, the legal owner of Lot 18, and as President of Ruhl Development Corporation, did not object to the request for variance for a side yard setback of zero feet for the garage which appeared on the Petition received by the Zoning Office and which was appropriately advertised but which was filed without their knowledge. It appears that the latter variance request was made by a draftsman in the office of the Petitibers' surveyor.

titioner Sara Ann Ruhl appeared and testified on her behalf. Also testifying the Petitioners was James W. McKee, a land surveyor. The Petitioners were represented by counsel. In opposition to the proposed variances were three neighbors two of whom are immediate neighbors, one each on either side of the Petitioner property. Each of the Protestants testified.

Testimony indicated that the Petitioners purchased the property in June, 1983, and the property consists of three lots, each 50 feet wide. The plat for the subdivision of which these three lots are a part was recorded in 1924. See Petitioners' Exhibit 2. The land was purchased from the same seller. Two cf the three lots are vacant and unimproved, but the middle lot does have an existing building, a single-family residence, and a garage at the rear of the property. This is more specifically shown on Petitioners' Exhibit 1. The variances requested by the Petitioners include the request to allow 50-foot lot widths in order to build on the two unimproved lots, eight-foot side yard setbacks in order to build 34-foot-wide homes, and a zero-foot side yard setback for the garage which, if the lot-width variances were granted, would lie directly on the side property line separating two of the lots involved. It appears from the testimony and evidence presented that the neighborhood primarily consists of 50-foot lot widths, eightfoot side yard setbacks on one side of the existing residences, and 12-foot side yard setbacks for the opposite sides of each residence.

The Protestants testified that they have lived in the neighborhood for many years, and that they are concerned with the potential construction of new homes. / Margaret Thomas, a neighbor to the right of the Petitioners' property, has lived in the neighborhood for 20 years and states that if a house was to be built on the vacant lot bordering hers, a serious water problem would result due to the topography of the property and which would result in a drainage problem. Additionally, Mrs. Thomas states she does not want a new home constructed within 18 feet of hers, which, if completed, would cause her to block off that side of ner 🏣 facing the new building.

Lindsley Benton, a Protestant, testified that he is the neighbor to the im-, mediate left and borders Lot 17 owned by the Petitioners. He also objects to the preposed variances. Mr. Benton argues the seriousness of the drainage problem

- 2 -

which, in his opinion, would cause him particular hardship in that the addition of a new home on the vacant lot next to him would cause water to drain onto his property where he now has a problem. This would be due to the topography of the area which rises in grade level from southwest to southeast. He also is of the opinion that the new homes would create a traffic and parking problem.

Louis Notzel, the third Protestant, agrees with the other Protestants, and raises a third objection to the proposed variances. It was brought out that both of the immediate neighbors, Mrs. Thomas and Mr. Benton, would be willing to purchase the unimproved lots and in fact had offered to do so from the seller of the property before the property was sold to the Petitioners.

It is agreed by the Protestants that they do not object to the requested variance for a zero-foot side yard setback for the existing garage.

The Petitioners seek relief from Sections 1802.3C.1. and 400.1, pursuant to Section 307, of the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations (BCZR).

After due consideration of the testimony and evidence presented, it appears that there would be a practical difficulty or unreasonable hardship resulting to the Petitioners if the variances requested to allow 50-foot lot widths in lieu V of 55-foot lot widths were not to be granted. Also, the same is true if the requested variance for a zero-foot side yard setback in lieu of 2.5 feet for the existing garage should be denied. However, the same cannot be held for the requestal eight-foot side yard setbacks. A side yard setback of eight feet instead of tex feet is granted for that side of a residence constructed on either of the unimproved lots for the side that is opposite either of the Protestants' homes. Inasmuch as there would exist an eight-foot side yard setback for the existing building on Lot 18 which would face any new building constructed on Lot 19, said eight-foot setback is granted. Thus, a building constructed on Lot 17 would be required to have at least a ten-foot side yard setback from the property line

separating Mrs. Thomas and the Petitioners, and would be permitted an eight-foot side yard setback from the property line separating Lots 18 and 19. An eight-foot setback from the existing building on Lot 18 to said property line between Lots 18 and 19 is granted. It would appear that there exists no such problem on the side separating Lots 18 and 17 from the existing building.

There is a strong presumption of the correctness of original zones and of comprehensive zoning. Howard County v. Dorsey, 438 A.2d 1339 (1982). There is a presumption of validity that must be accepted. Johnson & Wales College v. DiPiete, 448 A.2d 1271 (R.I., 1982). In interpreting the zoning regulations, the restrictive language contained must be strictly construed so as to allow the landowner the least restrictive use of his property. Lake Adventure, Inc. v. Zoning Hearing Bd. of Dingman Township, 440 A.2d 1284 (Pa. Cmwlth., 1982). When the language of a zoning regulation is clear and certain, there is nothing left for interpretation and the ordinance must be interpreted literally. Mongony v. Bevilacqua, 432 A.2d 661 (R.I., 1981).

Therefore, Section 1802.3C.1. must be enforced as it is clear and certain as to its meaning and intent. The zoning regulations, however, permit a variance, , pursuant to certain conditions as delineated in Section 307. To permit a variance to the "area" requirements of Section 1802.3C.1., the variance must be judged under the practical difficulties" or "unreasonable hardship" test, i.e., by looking to such dactors as the nature of the zone in which the property lies, the character of the immediate vicinity and the uses contained therein; whether, if the restriction upon the petitioner's property was removed, such removal would seriously afbuch neighboring property and uses; whether, if the restriction is not removes, the restriction would create practical difficulty or unreasonable hardship for the owner in relation to his efforts to make normal improvements in the character of that use of the property which is a permitted use under the use provisions of the regulation.

- 3 ~

A landowner can establish a right to a variance by showing that the effect of the regulations is to burden his property with an unreasonable hardship that is unique to his property. This can be accomplished by showing that the physical or topographical features of the property are such that the property cannot be used for a permitted purpose, or by showing that the property can be arranged for such use only at a prohibitive expense. Anderson v. Bd. of Appeals of Town of Chesapeake Beach, 22 Md. App. 28 (1974); Marlowe v. Zoning Hearing Bd. Haverford Township, 415 A.2d 946 (Pa. Cmwlth., 1980).

The Court of Special Appeals has held that a variance relating to certain "area" restrictions, as distinguished from restrictions on the use of the property, must be judged under the "practical difficulty" test. Anderson, supra. See Bd. of Adjustment, Etc. v. Kwik-Check Realty, 389 A.2d 1289 (Del. Supr., 1978). As noted in Anderson, the factors to be considered under this test in determining whether a variance should be granted are:

- 1. whether strict compliance with requirement would unreasonably prevent the use of the property for a permitted purpose or render conformance unnecessarily burdensome;
- 2. whether the grant would do substantial injustice to applicant as well as other property owners in district or whether a lesser relaxation than that applied for would give substantial re-
- whether relief can be granted in such fashion that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and public safety and welfare
- where is sufficient evidence to permit a finding that the hardship or difficult es experienced or would be experienced by the Petitioners were not caused by them and would be caused by the zoning restrictions from which they seek relief.

The neighborhood is comprised of homes built on lots divided by the same plat

which the property owned by the Petitioners are part. Petitioners' Exhibit 2

- 5 **-**

shows clearly that almost all of the lots in the neighborhood are 50 feet in width. Additionally, testimony showed that the existing homes were built at a time when 50-foot widths were acceptable under the zoning regulations and eight-foot side yard setbacks for one side with a total of 20 feet were also acceptable. The existing homes have one side with eight-foot setbacks. The Petitioners argue consistency and conformity with the surrounding neighborhood in support of the Petition filed. .his is important. If there is to be conformity and consistency, then the Petitioners are entitled to eight-foot setbacks on one side only. The practical effect of this decision to is to make for narrower homes by two feet, not insurmountable

The Petitioners can establish their right to variances by showing that the variances requested are the minimum variant that will afford relief. Marlowe, supra. The Petitioners have substantially the same amount of land available to them to build upon as do any of their neighbors whose rights to build on the land which was originally platted derived their validity from the 1924 recording prior to the time when the extrinsic requirement of today's zoning regulations were adopted. In the instant case, to force the Petitioners to resubdivide to meet the 55feet width would render their property valueless in that there exists a building on Lot 18, the middle of the three lots owned, which would render it improbable if not impossible to use Lots 17 and 19 for any useful purpose except open space, much desided by the Protestants but not required of the Petitioners based on the unique

cironal stances hereinbefore described. See John R. Greene Assoc. v. Zoning Hearing Lower Allen Townshir, 426 A.2d 175 (Pa. Cmwlth., 1981). This neighborhood anticle one, where many nonconforming uses with nonconforming lot characteristics Much of this development occurred prior to the existence of zoning regula-

The problem of water drainage, as important as it is to the Protestants, must be comsidered by the Petitioners when building, and they must meet all County required

- 6 -

regulations impacted by such construction on potential water and drainage situa-

Pursuant to the advertisement, posting of the property, and public hearing on this Petition held, and for the reasons above given, the variances requested as previously explained should be granted.

Therefore, .T IS ORDERED by the Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, this $2f^{+-}$ day of September, 1983, that the Petition for Variances to permit lot widths of 50 feet instead of the required 55 feet for the property described in Petitioners' Exhibit 1 be and is hereby GRANTED; that the side yard setback of zero feet instead of the required 2.5 feet for the existing garage in the rear of Lot 18 be and is hereby GRANTED; and that side yard setbacks of eight feet in lieu of the required ten feet as aforedescribed be and are hereby GRANTED, from and after the date of this Order, subject to the following:

> 1. The Petitioners may apply for their building permit, and be granted same upon receipt of this Order; however, Petitioners are hereby made aware that proceeding at this time is at their own risk until such time as the applicable appellate process from this Order has expired. If, for whatever reason, this Order is reversed, the Petitioners would be required to return, and be responsible for returning, said property to its original condition.

Baltimore County

PETITION FOR VARIANCES

THE RESIDENCE STATE OF THE PROPERTY STATE OF

8th Election District

ZONING: Detition for Variances

LOCATION: North side of College Avenue, 50 ft. Northwest of Greenspring Drive

DATE & TIME: Wednesday, September 21, 1933 at 10:30 A.M.

Room 106, County Office Building, 111 W. Chesapeake Avenue, Towson, Maryland

The Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, by authority of the Zoning Act and Regulations of Baltimore County, will hold a public hearing:

Petition for Variancesto permit lot widths of 50 ft. in lieu of the required 55 ft., side yard setbacks of 8 ft. in lieu of the required 10 ft. and a side yard setback of 0 ft. in lieu of the required 2.5 ft.

The Zoning Regulation to be excepted as follows: Section 1B02. 3. C. 1 - lot widths and side yard setbacks in D. R. 5.5 zone Section 400.1 - setback for accessory structure

All that parcel of land in the Eighth District of Baltimore County

Being the property of Sara Ann Ruhl, as shown on plat plan filed with the Zoning

In the event that this Petition is granted, a building permit may be issued within the thirty (30) day appeal period. The Zoning Commissioner will, however, entertain any request for a stay of the issuance of said permit during this period for good cause shown. Such request must be received in writing by the date of the hearing set above or made at the hearing.

> BY ORDER OF ARNOLD JABLON ZONING COMMISSIONER OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

MCKEE & ASSOCIATES, INC. Engineering - Surveying - Real Estate Development LUTHERVILLE, MARYLAND 21093 1717 YORK RD. Telephone: (301) 252-5820

June 29, 1983

DESCRIPTION TO ACCOMPANY PETITION FOR VARIANCE 602, 604, AND 606 COLLEGE AVENUE Beginning for the same at a point 50 feet Northwest of the intersection of College Avenue and Greenspring Drive on north side of College Ave. and designated as Lots 19, 18, and 17, Block N, as shown on a plat

dated May 3, 1924, and recorded among the Plat Records of Baltimore

County in Plat Book W.P.C. No. 7, Part 2, folio 128, and known as

"Luther-Villa".

BALTIMORE COUNTY
OFFICE OF PLANNING & ZONING
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204
494-3353

or self-defeating.

ARNOLD JABLON ZONING COMMISSIONER

ORDER RECEIVED FO

September 26, 1983

Mark P. Hanley, Jr., Esquire 206 Washington Avenue Towson, Maryland 21204

IN RE: Petition Zoning Variances N/S of College Avenue, 50' NW of Greenspring Drive - 8th Election District Sara Ann Ruhl, Petitioner

Case No. 84-80-A

Dear Mr. Hanley:

I have this date passed my Order in the above-referenced matter in accordance with the attached.

Zoning Commissioner

Sincerely,

AJ/srl Attachments

cc: Mr. Lindsley Benton 608 College Avenue Lutherville-Timonium, Maryland 21093

Mrs. Margaret Thomas 600 College Avenue Lutherville-Timonium, Maryland 21093 Mr. Louis Notzel

1608 Greenspring Drive Lutherville-Timonium, Maryland 21093 John W. Hessian, III, Esquire People's Counsel

August 23, 196

- 7 -

Mark P. Hanley, Jr., Esquire 206 Washington Avenue Baltimore, Maryland 21204

NOTICE OF HEARING Re: Petition for Variances N/S of College Ave., 50' NW of Greenspring Drive Sara Ann Ruhl - Petitioner Case No. 84-80-A

TIME: 10:30 A.M. DATE: Wednesday, September 21, 1983 PLACE: Room 106, County Office Building, 111 West Chesapeake

Avenue, Towson, Maryland

cc: James W. McKee 1717 York Road Lutherville, Maryland 21093

> Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County

BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND OFFICE OF FINANCE - REVENUE DIVISION MISCELLANEOUS CASH RECEIPT

No. 117674 ACCOUNT 4.01-615-000

FOR II the the star DE Good Him K. 1

C 011******3500:5 5075A

BALTIMORE COUNTY
OFFICE OF PLANNING & ZONING
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204
494-3353

ARNOLD JABLON ZONING COMMISSIONER

September 14, 1983

Mark P. Hanley, Jr., Esquire 206 Washington Avenue Towson, Maryland 21204

> Re: Petition for Variances N/S College Ave., 50' NW of Greenspring Drive Sara Ann Ruhl - Petitioner

Case No. 84-80-A

Dear Mr. Hanley:

This is to advise you that \$57.03 is due for advertising and posting of the above property. This fee must be paid before an Order is issued.

Please make the check payable to Baltimore County, Maryland, and remit to Mrs. Arlene January, Zoning Office, Room 113, County Office Building, Towson, Maryland 21204, before the hearing.

ng Commissioner No. 121523

OFFICE OF FINANCE - REVENUE DIVISION MISCELLANEOUS CASH RECEIPT

BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

ACCOUNT R-01-615-000 DATE 9/22/83

AMOUNT \$57.03

RECEIVED Sally Ruhl c/o Mark P. Hanley, Jr., Esquire FOR: Advertising & Posting Case #84-80-A

6 818 *** ** 5763 to \$228A

VALIDATION OR SIGNATURE OF CASHIER

Mark P. Hanley, Jr., 2sq. 206 Washington Ava Towson, Nd. 21204

McKee & Associates, Inc. 1717 York Rosi Lutharville, Nd. 21093

BALTIMORE COUNTY OFFICE OF PLANNING & ZONING

County Office Building 111 W. Chesapeake Avenue Towson, Maryland 21204

Your petition has been received and accepted for filing this 19th day of July , 1983.

Zoning Commissioner

Petitioner Sara Ann Rull

Petitioner's Mark P. Hanley, Jr., Esq.

Nicholas B. Commodari Chairman, Zoning Plans Advisory Committee Received by:

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING ZONING DEPARTMENT OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

84-80-A

| District Sth | Date of Posting Syst. 2,1983 |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Posted for: Variances | |
| | |
| Petitioner: Dara Unn Muhl Location of property: M/S of College Aven Drive | me 50'NN of Frenchring |
| Drive | / V |
| Location of Signs: N/S of College anen
Lungoring Drive in front of | we approx 120'NW of |
| | J 604 (Plage Coresul V |
| Remarks: | 1.20 1953 |
| Posted by Signatu | Date of return: Supt. 9, 1983 |
| Number of Signs: | |

| PETITION FOR VARIANCES Sth Election District | |
|--|--|
| ZONING: Petition for Variances LOCATION: North side of College Avenue, 50 ft. Northwest of Greenspring Drive DATE & TIME: Wednesday, September 21, 1983 at 10:30 A.M. PUBLIC HEARING: Room 106, County Office Building, 111 W. Chesapeaks Avenue, Towson, Maryland | |
| The Zoning Commissioner of Bal-
timore County, by authority of the
Zoning Act and Regulations of Bal-
timore County, will hold a public
hearing: Petition for Variances to permit
lot widths of 50 ft. in lieu of the | |
| required 55 ft., side yard setbacks of 8 ft. in lieu of the required 10 ft. and a side yard setback of 0 ft. in lieu of the required 2.5 ft. The Zoning Regulation to be excepted as follows: Section 1802.3.C.4—lot widths and | |
| side yard setbacks in D.R. 5.5 zone Section 400.1—setback for accessory structure All tht parcel of land in the Eighth District of Baltimore County Beginning for the same at a point 50 feet Northwest of the intersec- | |
| tion of College Avenue and Green-
apring Drive on north side of Col-
lege Ave. and designated as Lots
19, 18, and 17, Block N, as shown
on a plat dated May 3, 1924, and
recorded among the Plat Records
of Baltimore County in P. at Book | |
| W.P.C. No. 7, Part 2, folio 128, and
known as "Luther-Villa".
Being the property of Sara Ann
Ruhl, as shown on plat plan filed
with the Zoning Department.
In the event that this Petition is
granted, a building permit may be | |
| issued within the thirty (30) day appeal period. The Zoning Commissioner will, however, entertain any request for a stay of the issuance of said permit during this period for good cause shown. Such request must be received in writing by the | |
| date of the hearing set above or made at the hearing. By Order Of ARNOLD JABLON, Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County | |

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION

TOWSON, MD., September 1 , 1983

THIS IS TO CERTIFY, that the annexed advertisement was published in THE JEFFERSONIAN, a weekly newspaper printed day of _____September , 1983 , the AFSt publication appearing on the 1st day of _____September 19_83

Cost of Advertisement, \$ 22 75

O.R.5,5 D.R.5.5 AVENUE N 33° 47 W N 33° 47 W N 39° 47'W 55.661 50' VICINITY MAP EXISTING 10.5' PAYING TRUMAN E. THOMAS LINDSLEY R. BENTON 4388 / 439 (8) NOTES: **(6)** 1. EXISTING ZONING : D.R. 5.5 Z. PROPOSED USES; RESIDENTIAL WITH VARIANCES TO SECTION IBOZ. 3.C.I OF THE BALTIMORE COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS TO PERMIT LOT WIDTHS OF 50 IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED MINIMUM LOT WIDTH OF 55, AND TO PERMIT SIDEYARD WIDTHS OF 8' IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED MINIMUM SIDEYARD WIDTH OF 10'. EX. 2 STORY EX. I STORY FRAME OWLG. FRAME OWLG: ± 608 ± 600 EX. 11/2 STORY FRAME DWLG. # 600 # G02 PROPOSEO GREEN **≠**304 BLOG ENVELOPE 7 - PROPOSEO SLOG. ENVELOPE ? 40 RIW DR-5.5 PETITIONER'S
EXHIBIT DR-5.5 50 50 TO THE INTERSECTION OF COLLEGE AVE & GREENSPRING OR N 33° 47 W N 33° 47 W From #22 EX.G" WATER AS PER BOBE, DRWG NO 25-1097-A46 BOSE. ORWG. NO. SO G75-A10 EXISTING. PLAT TO ACCOMPANY PETITION FOR VARIANCE TO ZONING AVENUE COLLEGE O.R.5.5 LOTS 17, 18,+19 BLOCK N LUTHER - VILLA BALTIMORE CO., MO. ELECTION DISTRICT JUNE 20,1983 SCALE: 1'= ZO MCKEE & ASSOCIATES, INC. PLAT REFERENCE WRC. NO.7 - PART Z - 128 CIVIL ENGINEERS & LAND SURVEYORS 1717 YORK ROAD - LUTHERVILLE, MARYLAND 21093

W 11

